


## Interview Summary

Application No. <b>08/276,797</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Owen et al.</b>	
Examiner <b>Gregory L. Mills</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2106</b>	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory L. Mills (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Michael Levine, For Applicant (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview concluded 8/9/96

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 33 (proposed)

Identification of prior art discussed:

Laser Pulse (determined not to be prior art), Inagawa (5063280)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The proposed responses filed 6/26/96 and 8/9/96 (attached to the Office copy of this summary) were discussed in a series of telephone conversations between 6/26/96 and 8/9/96. It was agreed that the proposed declaration of Mr. Mark Owen filed 6/26/96 establishes that the applied Laser Pulse article discloses the work of the present inventive entity and is therefore not prior art against the claimed invention. It was further agreed that the proposed amendments to the claims filed on 8/9/96 would patentably define over the prior art of record, in particular Inagawa, if claim 1 were further limited to repetition rates of greater than 1 KHz, for the reasons stated in the attached reasons for allowance.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.